

Boardman River Crossing Form 5323 - Comments and Responses	
MDOT Comments	Response
<b>Funding Plan</b>	
1 This document needs to identify the estimated cost of the project elements, including the bridge and road widening.	A preliminary cost estimate has been added to the funding plan
2 This document needs to identify what type of grants will be applied to for funding this project. The grant names and their frequency should be indicated.	Grant types and anticipated NOFO schedules have been added to the funding plan
3 The document should indicate the commitment of the local agency to provide local funding for the project.	GTCRC resolution (commitment to funding) pending and forthcoming
4 The document should indicate that funding for an environmental assessment has already been secured.	Funding plan updated to note GTCRC is currently under contract to fund the EA
<b>Form 5323</b>	
<b>1 General Comments</b>	
a Please remove all references to "during the EA" in the 5323 form. Revise these statements to indicate the possible impacts on resources and what future coordination/action is needed because of the known or potential impacts.	All references to "during the EA" removed from Form 5323
b If you have documentation that has been completed that indicates no impacts to various resources, please include that documentation.	Impact assessment documentation added to Form 5323 as needed
c Relevant documentation from the PEL that assists in telling the story of the potential impacts of this project should be included.	Relevant documentation from the PEL has been referenced in Form 5323 and/or added as an attachment to the form. Attachment A provides a summary of the Boardman River Crossing PEL.
<b>2 Page 1: Project Purpose</b>	
a You mention the purpose is to provide less congestion for non-motorized users. What data has been gathered showing congestion is an issue for non-motorized users?	To clarify, the Purpose & Need from the PEL noted the following, "non-motorized connections for east-west movements are limited to existing busy and congested corridors creating safety concerns while transit riders are faced with increased headways and delays. Additional connections are needed for safety, greater mobility, and improved system resilience." The purpose in Form 5323 has been clarified. The need for additional and safe nonmotorized connections is documented on pages 24-31 of the PEL.
<b>3 Page 2: Natural Rivers</b>	
a Page 2 states: "During the Boardman River Crossing Planning and Environmental Linkages Study (PEL), a meeting was held on 1/28/22 with resource agencies to discuss the Locally Acceptable Alternative. Mr. Patrick Ertel from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) - Scenic Rivers, indicated the Hartman-Hammond Alternative (i.e., Locally Acceptable Alternative) was outside of the Boardman River Natural Rivers boundary. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated". Please provide some documentation of this because the Boardman River is a state designated natural river. (See natural rivers boardman map.)	Additional documentation has been provided as Attachment B to Form 5323. In summary, the proposed project is 1,200-2,200 feet north of the natural river boundary.
b Please indicate a Natural Rivers Part 305 permit will be needed unless you have documentation otherwise.	A Natural Rivers Part 305 permit will not be required.
<b>4 Page 6: Coastal Zones</b>	
a You indicate that the area is within the Garfield Township Coastal Zone Management Boundary when the area is in the EGLE coastal zone management area. Please refer to attachment 31383. Please clarify.	Form 5323 revised to note EGLE coastal zone management area
b Please describe what some potential impacts to the coastal zone could be depending on the alignment. Indicate that because of the impacts, more coordination will be needed.	Potential impacts and the need for additional coordination added to Form 5323
<b>5 Page 8: 100 Year Floodplain</b>	
a Please provide a map of the current floodplain in the project area.	Floodplain map added as Attachment C to Form 5323
b Please identify what potential impacts will occur to the floodplain.	Potential floodplain impacts added to Form 5323
<b>6 Page 10: Inland Lakes and Streams</b>	
a Please check the box to indicate that this project will have a direct impact to a regulated lake or stream.	Box checked to indicate impacts to stream/Part 301 Permit needed
b Identify the Boardman River as impacted. Also indicate that Hammond Rd crosses a Mussel Protocol Stream, (attachment 3135).	Form 5323 updated to indicate the Boardman River is a Group 1 Mussel Protocol Stream.
c Unless you have documentation otherwise, please indicate that a Part 301 permit will likely be needed and a USACE Joint Permit will not be needed.	Box checked to indicate impacts to stream/Part 301 Permit needed
<b>7 Page 11: Threatened and Endangered Species</b>	
a Please provide a state and federal Threatened and Endangered species lists.	State and federal Threatened and Endangered species lists have been attached as Attachment D to Form 5323
b On the form, please indicate what species are in the area and if an effect determination is known. If the effect determination is not known, please indicate the project conflicts.	Species listed on Form 5323. Effect determination is not known at this time. Form 5323 revised to indicate the project conflicts.

c	The document states "During the PEL, an Ecological Assessment was completed for the Boardman River valley within the study area. No Threatened and Endangered (T&E) species were observed in the assessment area,"	The Ecological Assessment was conducted by qualified biologist (GEI Consultants) and an ecological report was prepared as part of the PEL. The report can be found on page 149 of the attached Boardman PEL Appendices. For the PEL, only the Boardman River Valley was assessed. As noted in Form 5323, an additional ecological assessment will be conducted (Spring/Summer 2023 ) for the US-31/Hartman Road intersection and Hartman Road realignment.
	How was that determined? Was it through an ecological report, survey, pictures? This should cover the whole impacted area (total project limit.)	
<b>8</b>	<b>Page 13: Historic Properties and Archeological Resources</b>	
a	Please complete the LAP CR forms to indicate what potential impacts to cultural resources may occur.	As noted in Form 5323, the project is Not Excepted. Therefore, a Section 106 Application will be prepared and submitted. It is anticipated the Section 106 Application will be prepared and submitted late Spring 2023.
b	You state that in January 2023, a desktop review was conducted? Who conducted this review?	The desktop review was conducted by qualified Archaeologist/Historian (Orbis Environmental Consulting). The desktop review has been included as Attachment E.
<b>9</b>	<b>Page 14: Section 4(f)</b>	
a	Please indicate if an adverse impact is possible given the scope of the bridge. Identify what additional coordination is needed (without deferring to "during the EA...").	Form 5323 noted potential impacts and additional coordination needed (individual Section 4(f) analysis and resource agency and OWJ coordination). Form updated to specify adverse impact.
<b>10</b>	<b>Page 15: Agricultural Properties</b>	
a	There does not seem to be PA 116 farmland within the limits, see attachment 3134 and please clarify.	Form 5323 revised to note PA 116 farmlands are not located within project area.
<b>11</b>	<b>Page 16: Contamination Sites</b>	